



Project UK Fisheries Improvements

Channel scallop Steering Group meeting minutes

Thursday 19th January 201

Brixham Laboratory, Brixham

09.30 – 12.15

Attendees:

Jim Portus	SWFPO
Iain Spear	Coombe Fisheries
Ewen Bell	CEFAS
Ruth Hoban	New England Seafood
Gus Caslake	Seafish
Mike Park	SFSAG
Nathan de Rozarieaux	Falfish
Tim Huntingdon	Poseidon
Adam Green	Lyons
Andrew Pillar	Interfish
Paul Trebilcock	CFPO
Lauren Parkhouse	Devon & Severn IFCA
Rosana Ourens	CEFAS
Moyra Patience	Samways
Robin Masefield	CEFAS
Ally Dingwall	Sainsburys

Apologies:

Bryce Stewart	York Uni
Nick Prust	SWIFA
Jeremt Shea	New England Seafood
Simon Dixon	MMO
Estelle Brennan	Lyons
Hannah Macintyre	M&S
Sarah Clark	Devon & Severn IFCA
Clarus/helen	WWF
Mark Webber	Oceanfish
Cassie Leisk	New England Seafood
Claire Pescod	MSC
Colin Trundle	Cornwall IFCA



1. Welcome, introductions & apologies

CN welcomed everyone to the 2nd bi-annual Channel scallop FIP Steering Group meeting under Project UK Fisheries Improvements (PUKFI). She apologised for the absence of our usual Chair due to illness.

2. Minutes & action points

There was one name that needed amending in the minutes of the last meeting. Apart from that there were no comments and the minutes were signed off.

Action point number	Steering group member	Action	Status	How it has been addressed
1	CN	To ensure funders are aware that this project is not a guarantee of certification	Completed	A point was made to communicate on this.
2	CN	To map the fishery	Ongoing	Could be part of the research we do around this fishery
3	CN	A group representative to report to NWWAC on the project at some point and CN/CP to attend the Scallop Industry Consultation Group in September in Edinburgh	Complete for SICG, ongoing for NWWAC	CN present the project to the SICG
4	CN	To investigate whether the anglo-spanish PO are interested in participating.	Ongoing	This will be done before the next meeting
5	MF	To investigate about informing and engaging with Pesche de Betanne on this matter	Completed	They are interested to maybe do their own pre-assessment.
6	CN	To get in contact with Lisa Readdy at Cefas, the chair of the ICES monkfish group and IFRAMER	Completed	Lisa is now part of the steering group although she couldn't be at this meeting



7	CP/CN	CN to progress Pre-assessment updates for channel scallop and western channel monkfish.	Completed	Acoura were chosen to carry out the Pas which are now complete
8		Confirmation of Action 9.	Completed	
9	CN/CP	To develop a draft MoU and CN to circulate if for discussion and input by email	Ongoing	The ToR was circulated before the meeting
10	All	To input to MoU development once received by email	Ongoing	We then discussed the ToR as a group. Suggestion are in the section below. CP to include suggested changes and re-circulate ToR. We can consider the next version as signed via email and then will physically sign it at the next meeting.
11	CN	To circulate link to Doodle Poll for next meeting	Complete	

3. Terms of Reference

It was agreed that the chair position should be reviewed annually.

It was suggested that the ToR should say something like 'get up to a point where they can go for MSC assessment'. The fishery should be able to not go for assessment if it wishes.

Bullet 2 – It was suggested we should weaken the word 'ambassador'. Suggestion of the word 'Proponent'? It was said that this bullet might already be covered somewhat in the 'help disseminate information' bullet.

It was also said that there may be repetition between bullet 16 & 17.

Bullet 25 – It was asked 'who decides if something is appropriate? PT – The catching sector is the only one who will be impacted. ND felt that we should discuss the actions first before signing the ToR.

It was decided that CN would make the changes suggested and send round the group. The group would then have one month in which to send back their track changes and then we would sign off the ToR via email.



Minutes action 1 – CN to amend ToR & send round group

Minutes action 2 – Everyone to send track changes of ToR to CN

4. Recap of aims and objectives

CN reminded the group of the aim of project which is to make improvements to get the target fisheries up to a level where it could be MSC certified. All the FIPs will follow the MSC's definition of a credible FIP.

After this meeting the aim is to progress actions that are agreed on by the group. Not all actions start in the first year so at the next meeting we will have a second look at the actions that are coming up in the second year.

5. Scallop pre-assessment results and discussion

Tim Huntingdon from Poseidon joined us to present the pre-assessments and draft action plans. Acoura carried out the pre-assessments but Poseidon created the action plans so as not to have any conflict of interest in future full assessments.

TH explained some MSC terms such as:

- Target species: The species you are considering under Principle 1, that you want to eventually carry the MSC certificate.
- Main: Non-target species that comprise 5% or more, by weight of the total catch. Or 2% if the species is less resilient.
- Minor: All other species not considered 'main', are considered minor.
- CR 2.0: The most recent version of the Certification Requirements (the standard) that we are using as the basis for these pre-assessments.
- Primary species: All non-target species that are managed via limit or target reference points.
- Secondary species: All non-target species that are not managed through reference points, and all out-of-scope species unless considered ETP.
- ETP: Endangered, Threatened & Protected.
- Out of scope: Birds, mammals & Reptiles.
- The Unit of Assessment (UoA) is the stock and gear type being assessed, Unit of Certification (UoC) is the vessels that you want to be certified.

TH commenced the presentation on the pre-assessment results. This can be seen in a separate document which will be available on the FIP webpage on the Seafish website.

Scallops have no main bycatch species, there are some minor monkfish and other secondary species. The data is catch not landings.



PT – Sole is the biggest bycatch.

JH – One of the problems with the fishery is we know about landings but less about catch.

Issues and opportunities were discussed, such as, there are no reference points for this stock so the Risk Based Framework (RBF) should be used for MSC assessment. However, this stock comes out as high risk under RBF. There is also jurisdictional confusion under Principle 3 (management) and no defined stock boundaries agreed to base management on. There is no HCR that is responsive to the state of the stock. We should aim at least for agreement between managers on the definition of the stock, but it doesn't have to be imbedded in the legal framework immediately.

TH gave an explanation of harvest strategy vs Harvest Control Rules (HCRs) in the MSC standard. Explanation of the sections of Principle 2. MSC is evidence based.

Only 1 PI was below 60 in p2. Info PIs were sub 80 because lack of quantitative info on bycatch.

Implicit understanding of where stock is going to be kept but no explicit objectives.

Decision making process - If solve stock management areas this will cascade through.

Pas are usually quick precautionary.

6. Scallop action plan presentation & discussion

Notes from call with Bryce:

The action plan is ambitious. The scallop fishery is lightly managed. There needs to be political willingness, it won't happen unless Defra & the MMO commit. It should be our priority to engage with government. It should be a priority for Defra as it is a socially important fishery because it is so lucrative. A new economic report by Seafish has suggested that the increase in the scallop fishery may have peaked. There are early signs of a decreasing CPUE. We should involve Claire Soztek and Bangor. Instead of putting York Uni as an action lead, we should put 'the relevant Seafish SAG members' so that Mike Kaiser and Bryce could work on it together. The research could be a nice PHD that Mike and Bryce could look for funding for and supervise together. The industry might be more comfortable with that than just York Uni.

Action Plan action 1

There was discussion around the difference between stock assessment units and stock management units. Is Action1 jumping the gun when it refers to 'stock management units' being defined?



Cefas gave an update on the stock assessment project and explained that we are not far away from proposing stock units and even international agreement. The UK scallop project hasn't agreed yet on these stock units though.

The thinking at the moment about the stock units is: There is a gap mid channel so you can treat east and west channel separately. Western channel north and south is different. In eastern you can split north and south too.

TH – we should just look at UK side of the Channel for the FIPs as it sounds like there is a defensible stock unit there.

Work being done by ICES. But there is work we can do to pull that together. And get it ready to put to consultation.

Management doesn't have to be at that level that the assessment is.

JP - Year three timescale is too short.

PT – in Milestone 3 it doesn't say who it will be agreed by. Everyone needs to be consulted, this should be put into the action plan.

MP – the managers have to manage the stock. Not everyone will agree.

GC- how realistic is milestone 3? It was agreed that we should take out 'and incorporated into the management process'. Although this is the ultimate aim of the stock assessment project.

JP – we are a long way off.

JH – we should have the aim of management at the end though.

MP commented that they want as many fisheries as they can get MSC certified

Action lead to be Cefas

No funding required

Action plan action 2

MP – are there other harvest strategies we can import from other countries?

Cefas – Most other countries use quotas

There was discussion on the UK Scallop group (that is doing the stock assessment). This project ties in with that one so we should use them to help define the strategies that can be applied. A lot of the



P1 stuff has the same aims and has already commence. We need to show them this action plan (Chloe has already introduced them to the project). These P1 actions can be slightly more passive from the point of view of PUKFI. There was a suggestion that the UK scallop project 'lead' this action but in the sense of overseeing it and ensuring that their project aligns with this one.

Minutes Action 3: for JH and JP to discuss the actions with the UK scallop project and see if they are willing oversee that these actions are happening

Defra asked if we have engaged marine Scotland as we are looking at the overarching English Channel fishery which includes a lot of Scottish boats. Helen is happy to share with Malcolm.

Minutes Action 4: Helen will share within government.

Action lead to possible be the UK scallop group subject to agreement

No funding required

Action plan action: 3

Mike P highlighted the North Sea nephrops plan that they developed with Cefas which was adaptive. Might be worth having someone review of that development process for the next meeting.

Minutes Action 5: for CN to get information from MP and summarise for the group for the next meeting

Jim highlighted the management that IFCA's have may score better than the overall fishery.

Adaptive is going to be a priority in the other scallop project when it investigates potential management. Precautionary can also be embedded in management plan.

Current reporting doesn't allow for knowing exactly what is caught within the IFCA district and outside. This would be useful information to have so we understand the scale of the problem. For example, if most scallops are from within the IFCA district, that is less of a problem because IFCA management is mostly adaptive already. But if most are caught outside of IFCA areas, we have more work to do to make the management adaptive.

Minutes Action 6: for CN to liaise with MMO to see if this data is available

The timeline for the UK scallop project is ongoing but started with a view to be 3 years. They think they will have their stock research produced in 6 months' time.

They could lead on this action also, subject to agreement.

JH was reluctant to put any action directly on them without consulting them and also didn't want to put too much on them.



Minutes Action 7: for JH to investigate the overlap between the two projects, if there are any gaps.

No funding needed.

Action 4

Cefas says there is a plan in place to collect all needed data. They will review if this is adequate for this project.

Cefas to lead and update at the 6 monthly meeting

Action 5

NR asked the question whether Seafish already did this observer work.

Cefas – there is some coverage of scallop dredging under the current observer program but it is minimal. There's bits of info around such as Claire Soztek's Phd. And they may be able to include this work as part of their dredge survey for the other scallop project.

The action could be a year of running benthic impact studies with photos. Skippers can help generate the data. Cefas can mount cameras on boat as sorting. Marine Scotland is apparently already looking into cameras for scallop dredges.

This action point is subject to funding

Cefas will lead this action

Minutes Action 8: CN to discuss further with Cefas to cost the necessary review of information.

Further action may be required after this depending if the current data is adequate or not. Further funding can be sought later.

Action 6

CN described the conversation she had with Bryce from York Uni and his suggestions about the Seafish SAG.

This action is similar to the crab and lobster action plan as they cover similar areas so the same ETP map may be relevant to overlay with the fishery footprint.

JNCC may have already done some of this work.



Minutes Action 9: HH to provide CN with a contact at JNCC to investigate this.

Should add 'if necessary' onto the end of the year 2 milestone.

Seafish SAG may be able to lead this action.

There may be funding required, depending if JNCC or MMO will do the footprint work without being paid, or if someone at the Seafish SAG has a student who could do it.

Action 7

PT feels that as the fishery complies with MSFD and achieving good environmental status then they should meet the MSC standard. Their commitment to the sustainability of habitats should be met through the MPA network. They have already been through considerable consultation and loss of fishing grounds for habitat reasons. PT feels it may be a problem if there needs to be more closed areas and this may hinder the CFPOs involvement in the project. Juliette Hatchman also had concerns about extra restrictions. Both were not agreeing to signing up to it as it currently. They would like some more flexibility to not be held to additional management if the footprint assessment says they would need it.

MP noticed that the standard refers to common habitats as well as VMEs. So, it is going to be even more complex.

PT was concerned that the current MPA network may not be enough to meet the standard but he doesn't want to go further than these current MPAs.

Discussion about who has to do the p2 actions. Is it every boat in the fishery or just the boats going for MSC? Chloe explained that P2 looks at just the target vessels and other certified vessels on the same fishery. Expand explanation.

The IFCAs have done a lot of work on VMEs in their areas.

Action lead: same as crab & lobster or discuss with Seafish SAG

Funding may have to be sought

Action 8

This action could be address in the project that covers the previous 2 actions. For example if there was a Phd student working on it.

Is the year 1 timescale for the SICA too ambitious?



There was a SICA analysis carried out by John Cotter and Bill Lart for the ecological risk assessment in 2011.

Seafish SAG or Cefas could lead.

May require funding.

Action 9

HH said we already have management units so we use the right one depending on the management tool you want to use to manage the fishery. There was discussion that this might not be the right way to do it, we should choose the correct management unit first and then the tool.

JH – Once we define the stock units we need more clarity on management. Defra could coordinate some sort of informing exercise.

Defra to lead on this action

No funding required

Action 10

It was decided to revisit this action in the meeting in 6 months as it draws from other actions that need to be initiated first.

Action 11

There was discussion over whether this group and the work we are doing counted as an internal review. We have regular meetings to discuss the management. We also will contract a consultant to do annual reviews of the FIP and update the BMT. Does this count as an external review?

Minutes Action 10: CN and TH to investigate with standards if other fisheries have used this argument successfully.



Minutes Actions summary table

Number	Lead	Action	Status
1	CN	To amend ToR & send round group	Complete
2	All	To send track changes of ToR to CN	Complete
3	JH/JP	To discuss the actions with the UK scallop project and see if they are willing oversee that these actions are happening	
4	HH	To share the project outputs including Action Plan with government	
5	CN	To get information from MP and summarise for the group for the next meeting	Ongoing
6	CN	To liaise with MMO to see if this data is available	Complete
7	JH	To investigate the overlap between the two projects, if there are any gaps.	
8	CN	To discuss further with Cefas to cost the necessary review of information	Complete
9	HH	to provide CN with a contact at JNCC to investigate this	Complete
10	CN/TH	To investigate with standards if other fisheries have used this argument successfully.	Complete